

12/26/95

Dear Hal,

I'm about half-way through Walt Brown's Treachery in Dallas and aspects of it puzzle me.

You know him better so ^I present them to you.

The first thing I noticed is that for all his drawing on other writing he writes mine ^{only} to others who used it later and also uses it as his own work. I am used to that and it does not bother me but with Brown I find myself wondering why.

At first I believed it could be because he remained put out over my telling him that the show he was doing was not the one I understood you wanted and as I did not tell him, was designed to promote him, make him important. I also believed he was put out because he believes he knows all and was so wrong on not using lights when he filmed me, as I told him in advance he would need to do. I've not heard from him since then, not even with the information he promised about something to be published.

Then I began to notice that he did not refer to FBI matters the way the FBI always does, does not distinguish between sources and informers. He never refers to a real deposition as a deposition while referring to anything in paper as a deposition. He uses "testimony" incorrectly throughout and most of the uses are wrong in that what he refers to as testimony is not that at all.

He omits from his writing where it is very relevant what he got from O in NO, which is in his biblio. although all my books are not, and from the first two what is also particularly relevant, to say nothing of M. For example, in referring to Oswald's lack of security clearance or possibly being confidential, he does not refer to his having CRYPTO clearance and he never asked me about that or about anything else that is so relevant to his book. Yet having WW II with the pictures in it he says that Oswald did change his shirt after leaving the TSBD.

I've actually begun to wonder if he had been an FBI SA. That was one of the first two things he told me when he first phoned me. The other is that he has a PhD and teaches high school. On that call I referred him to what became his publisher.

His avoidance of the basic, factual work is as obvious as is his extensive use of what he has to know is not dependable. He is deep into the theories and those who write them and has become one of them if he did not begin that way. This, too, seems to be inconsistent with his training to be an SA and with what could have made him want to become one.

If you have any thoughts I'll appreciate them. Or relevant knowledge.

Best,

Hal